

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant acknowledges that claims 3-10 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

### **I. Information Disclosure Statement**

Regarding the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 25, 2008, Applicant notes that while the Examiner has returned the form PTO-1449 submitted therewith, the Examiner inadvertently did not initial next to the one foreign document (EP 1 033 557) listed thereon. Accordingly, Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner return with the next Office paper a signed and fully initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 indicating that the above-noted reference has been considered on the merits.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayashi et al. (U.S. 6,144,318). Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 recites the features of a geography interpreting section configured to generate geographic information for indicating a characteristic of the area around the destination as a voice output; and a voice output section configured to output the voice output in response to only the assigning of the destination by the user, in accordance with the geographic information generated at the geography interpreting section. Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi does not disclose or suggest such a combination of features.

Regarding the above-noted features, Applicant notes that on page 3 of the Office Action,

the Examiner has stated that, in Hayashi, the “guidance information comprises roads, building shapes, landmark information”, and that “guidance data is output by voice ... when the destination is assigned only by a user” (emphasis added). Based on these comments by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misinterpreted the above-noted features recited in claim 1.

In particular, Applicant notes that claim 1 does **not** recite that the guidance data is output by voice when the destination is assigned only by a user. Instead, claim 1 recites that the voice output section is configured to output the voice output in response to only the assigning of the destination by the user. Applicant submits that the above-noted phrases clearly have different meanings.

In this regard, Applicant notes that the phrase “guidance data is output by voice when the destination is assigned only by a user”, as set forth by the Examiner, means that guidance data will be output if the destination is assigned by a user, but will not be output if the destination is assigned by something other than the user (e.g., see page 3 of the Office Action in which the Examiner has stated that “step S1 is NOT assigned by the user, it is assigned by positioning unit 2”).

In contrast, Applicant notes that the phrase “output the voice output in response to only the assigning of the destination by the user” means that the only requirement for outputting the voice output is that the destination be assigned by the user. In other words, according to claim 1, as soon as the destination is assigned by the user (i.e., “in response to only the assigning of the destination by the user”), the voice output is output. By providing such an ability, the specification describes that the “user can know the geography of the area around the destination

without scrolling a display screen or viewing a displayed map as conventionally required” (see paragraph [0028]).

In this regard, Applicant notes that the guidance system of Hayashi does not provide the above-noted ability of enabling a user to know the geography of the area around the destination without scrolling a display screen or viewing a displayed map. In particular, Applicant notes that in Hayashi, when a destination is assigned, the guidance system does not output voice describing geographic information of the area around the destination. Instead, in Hayashi, it is necessary for the user to begin traveling along the guidance route before any geographic information will be output by voice to the user. For example, in Hayashi, it is clearly disclosed that the navigation method calculates a route to an entered destination and provides route guidance to the user by display or voice as the present position of the user changes (see col. 1, lines 55-58).

Thus, in Hayashi, because the voice output is only provided to the user as the present position of the user changes, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in claim 1 of a geography interpreting section configured to generate geographic information for indicating a characteristic of the area around the destination as a voice output; and a voice output section configured to output the voice output in response to only the assigning of the destination by the user, in accordance with the geographic information generated at the geography interpreting section.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Hayashi, an indication of which is kindly requested. Regarding claim 2 and non-elected claims 3-10, Applicant notes that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered

patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichi YOSHIOKA

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2008.08.13 16:35:22 -04'00'

---

Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicant

KWF/krq  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 13, 2008